

EXAMINER INTERVIEW SUMMARY

On Tuesday, September 7, 2004, the Applicants held a telephone interview with the Examiner. Claim 1, the Helms reference and the Wagner reference were discussed. The Applicants agreed to submit the following response.

REMARKS

Claims 1, 13, and 25 are amended herein. Claims in the instant case are Claims 1-32.

102(b) Rejection

Claims 1-3, 13, 15, 25, 26, 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Helms (5,760,760). The Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully assert that the present invention as recited in Claim 1, as amended, is not anticipated by Helms and that Claims 2, and 3, as they depend from independent Claim 1 and recite additional features of the present claimed invention, are not anticipated by Helms.

Independent Claim 1 has been amended herein to recite that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to:

“A portable computer system comprising:
a processor coupled to a bus;.....
a lighted display device coupled to said bus and for
providing a visual display;....
a data storage device coupled to said bus and
comprising preconfigured dynamically adjustable
brightness range setting data for implementing a

plurality of different simultaneously stored ranges, wherein each stored range of said plurality of stored ranges comprises a brightness range maximum value and a brightness range minimum values; and

wherein said processor automatically selects a stored range of said plurality of stored ranges based on said ambient light information signal from said light sensor.” (emphasis added)

Claims 2 and 3 are dependent on Claim 1 and recite further features of the present claimed invention.

In contrast to the present claimed invention, Helms does not teach or suggest the limitation of Claim 1 in which the portable computer system comprises “a data storage device... for implementing a plurality of different simultaneously stored ranges, wherein each stored range of said plurality of stored ranges comprises a brightness range maximum value and a brightness range minimum values” and wherein the processor selects a range for dynamic brightness control. Helms discloses only a single translation table to provide a one-to-one correspondence between an ambient light level (AL) input and an automatic brightness level (ABL) output. Therefore there is no way in Helms to store more than one range at the same time and no way to select between more than one range. Helms does allow for the value in the table to be changed to adapt to a user selection, and in this way may store several user defined brightness values which may comprise a single range, as discussed in Column 2, lines 35-40. However, Helms does not allow the simultaneous storage of a plurality of ranges or a mechanism that would allow the selection of one.

Applicants respectfully assert that there is no basis for concluding that the device of Helms, or any of the other elements of Helms, uses a portable computer system having a plurality of simultaneously stored ranges of brightness values in the manner of the present invention; specifically, in a portable computer system as recited in independent Claim 1 as amended herein. Applicants further submit that Helms does not teach or suggest the present claimed invention as recited in Claims 2 and 3 that are dependent on Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1, 2, and 3 overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Independent Claims 13 and 25 recite similar limitations to those of Claim 1 argued above, and Applicants respectfully re-assert each and every point argued above regarding the rejections of Claim 1 that the present invention as recited in Claims 13 and 25, as amended, are not anticipated by Helms. Moreover, Claim 15, as it depends from Claim 13 and Claims 26, 28 and 29, as they depend from Claim 25, recite additional features of the present claimed invention, and as such are not anticipated or suggested by Helms.

103 Rejection

Claims 4-6 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helms (US Patent No. 5,576,076). Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully assert that the present invention as recited in Claims 4-6 and 16-18 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Helms, and that the present claimed invention is therefore patentable over Helms.

Applicants respectfully re-assert each and every point argued above regarding the rejections of independent Claims 1 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Applicants thus respectfully re-assert that, as amended herein, Claim 1 incorporates subject matter including “implementing a plurality of different simultaneously stored ranges, wherein each stored range of said plurality of stored ranges comprises a brightness range maximum value and a brightness range minimum values implementing a plurality of different stored ranges, wherein each stored range of said plurality of stored ranges comprises a brightness range maximum value and a brightness range minimum value ...” (emphasis added).

Helms teaches an apparatus for adjusting the brightness level of an LCD based on ambient light, but Helms only teaches a single range comprising a plurality of brightness levels (ABL), each of which corresponds to one of a plurality of ambient light levels (AL), and which are automatically updated upon manual adjustment by a user. Nowhere does Helms teach or suggest the limitation of such a plurality of simultaneously stored brightness ranges.

Claims 4-6 depend upon independent Claim 1, as amended herein. These dependent claims incorporate each and every one of the elements of the corresponding independent claim on which they depend. Therefore, the present invention as recited in Claims 4-6 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Helms, and that the present claimed invention is therefore patentable over Helms.

As amended herein, Claim 13 incorporates similar embodiments to those of Claim 1 including "... a lighted display device coupled to said bus and for providing a visual display;....a data storage device coupled to said bus and comprising a plurality of simultaneously stored preconfigured dynamically adjustable brightness ranges, wherein each stored range of said plurality of stored ranges comprises a brightness range maximum value and a brightness range minimum value;..." (emphasis added). Helms teaches an apparatus for adjusting the brightness level of an LCD based on ambient light, but nowhere does Helms teach or suggest the limitation of such a plurality of stored brightness ranges.

Claims 16-18 depend upon independent Claim 13, as amended herein. These dependent claims incorporate each and every one of the elements of the corresponding independent claim from which they depend. Therefore, the present invention as recited in Claims 16-18 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Helms, and that the present claimed invention is therefore patentable over Helms.

Claims 7, 8, 14, 19, 20 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helms (5,760,760) in view of Wagner (5,933,130). Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully assert that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 7, 8, 14, 19, 20 and 27 are not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Helms in view of Wagner, and that the present claimed invention is therefore patentable over Helms in view of Wagner.

Applicants respectfully re-assert each and every point argued above regarding the rejections of independent Claims 1, 13 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Applicants thus respectfully re-assert that, as amended herein, Claim 1 incorporates subject matter including “a portable computer system comprising... a light sensor coupled to said bus and for providing an ambient light information signal...a data storage device comprising preconfigured dynamically adjustable brightness range setting data for implementing a plurality of different simultaneously stored ranges, wherein each stored range of said plurality of stored ranges comprises a brightness range maximum value and a brightness range minimum values”

Claims 7, and 8, 14, 19, 20 and 27 depend from independent Claim 1, as amended herein. Claims 14, 19 and 20 depend from independent Claim 13, as amended herein. Claim 27 depends from independent Claim 25, as amended herein. These dependent claims incorporate each and every one of the elements of the corresponding independent claim on which they depend.

Helms in combination with Wagner does not teach or suggest the claimed limitation of “[a] portable computer system comprising...a light sensor coupled to said bus and for providing an ambient light information signal...a data storage device...for implementing a plurality of different stored ranges, wherein each stored range of said plurality of stored ranges comprises a brightness range maximum value and a brightness range minimum values.” Rather, although Wagner teaches a plurality of brightness ranges, Wagner does not teach dynamically altering brightness levels based on an ambient light signal. Specifically, Wagner teaches a device which slavishly rotates through different ranges, so that the brightness

fluctuates as one is working, ostensibly to protect the user's eyes from stress. Nowhere does Wagner suggest to measure the ambient light and adjust brightness with respect thereto. Therefore, there is no suggestion or instruction in the art to realize the claimed invention from the combination of Wagner and Helms.

Dependent Claims 9-12, 21-24 and 30-32 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. In view of the arguments put forth above regarding the rejections of independent Claims 1, 13 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), Applicants respectfully submit that the objection to Claims 9-12, 21-24 and 30-32 is overcome.

CONCLUSION

Based on the arguments presented above, it is respectfully asserted that Claims 1-32 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, allowance of these Claims is respectfully solicited.

Applicants further point out that no contested Claims remain in the present Application.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP



Anthony C. Murabito

Reg. No. 35,295

Date: Sept. 7, 2004

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113
(408) 938-9060